

## **Transactional Leadership as a Moderator between Self-Leadership Strategies and Innovative Behavior**

Intan Marfarrina Omar and Norashikin Mahmud

Faculty of Management, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia

**Abstract** Leadership in organizations is important in shaping workers' perception and increase employee work performance. There are several types of leadership style that are important in affecting employee work performance and one of it is transactional leadership. Transactional leadership, in contrast to transformational leadership, is based more on reinforcement and exchanges approach. Previous studies that explored about the transactional leadership effect in terms of direct effect or moderating effect relating to organizational behavior such as innovative behavior are scarce. Innovation is a complex process and not happened in a vacuum situation, interaction between each of the organizational members is very important. Addressing this issue, this study proposes that transactional leadership moderates the relationship of self-leadership strategies (behavior-focused, constructive thought pattern, natural reward and physical vitality) with innovative behavior. In a field study with 485 engineers from Electrical and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing in Malaysia, this study showed that behavior-focused strategies, constructive thought pattern strategies, natural reward strategies and physical vitality strategies of self-leadership positively related to innovative behavior when transactional leadership is high. Transactional leadership positively and significantly moderates the relationship between each of self-leadership strategies with innovative behavior. The finding contributes to the enrichment of innovative behavior concept by including the transactional leadership as moderator in helping the researcher to explore on how leadership differences contribute to difference research outcomes.

**Keywords:** self-leadership, innovative behavior, transactional leadership, behavior-focused strategies, constructive thought pattern strategies, natural reward strategies and physical vitality strategies

### **1. Introduction**

The business environment is rapidly changing due to globalization, technological changes, tough competition and all this has affected the world of work. This situation lead to the high requirement of innovation phase in an organization in order to cope with business demands. Employees need to be more innovative with the opportunity exploration, generation of ideas, support the ideas and implementation of ideas into real environment during innovation in producing a high quality of products. Since innovation process is not an easy process, employees need to be strong enough to involve with all the innovation stages mentally or physically. An employee needs to control their own behavior, influencing and leading themselves through the use of specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies to behave in desirable ways. This specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies referring to self-leadership strategies.

However, because of the complexity of an innovation process, interaction between each of the organizational members is also important since innovation not happened in a vacuum situation. They have to connect and communicate each other especially with their leader in work process in order to get work done. Used of teamwork in organizations has been a significant increase year by year as a means to simultaneously improve productivity and employee quality of work life. The role of a leader become very important since about 70% of employees prefer to work autonomously under a supervisor (Boerner, Eisenbeis, & Griesser, 2007).

---

Applying of self-leadership strategies itself is not enough since employee's self-leadership strategies are not a complete substitutes for the function of organizational leader (Stewart, Courtright, & Manz, 2011). They also need support, guides, encouragement given by a leader to work towards the organization's vision. These situations also make leader's leadership as important variables that might influence innovative behavior.

Interest in leadership effect is increasing (Day, 2000). Many scholars have investigated about the direct effect of leadership. Enrichment of leadership research has become wider when there are scholars started to investigate the indirect effect of leadership in the relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. Different leadership styles may buffer or reinforce the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables. For example, transformational leadership have found moderates the relationship between psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams in Ghana (Kumako & Asumeng, 2013), need for leadership moderates the relationship between leadership and individual outcomes (Vries, Roe, & Taillieu, 2002) and ethical leadership have moderates the relationship between employee psychological contracts and citizenship behavior (Philipp & Lopez, 2013).

Although the leadership concept have developed more stable with the new approaches of leadership concept, transactional leadership still stay as a strong concept in the leadership development that can give big impact on a certain variables. Transactional leadership refers to leaders guide or motivates their followers in the direction of established goals by clarifying role and task requirements. The approaches are based on contingent reward and management by exception (active or passive). Although the overall evidence seems to indicate that transactional leadership is more strongly correlated with negative findings and indirect effect with innovative behavior, it started to show a positive effect a few years ago. Politis (2004) in his research have found a positive and significant relationship between transactional leadership and the stimulant determinant of the work environment for creativity among service organization operating employees in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Furthermore, findings show that transactional leadership contribute to management innovation among 1000 Dutch firms in the Netherlands (Vaccaro, Jansen, Bosch, & Volberda, 2012). With the different population, transactional leadership style also positively predicted innovative behavior among bank managers (Khan & Aslam, 2012). Because of the inconsistent findings, transactional leadership may buffer the effect of self-leadership strategies on innovative behavior. The aim of the current research is therefore to clarify the moderating role of transactional leadership styles on the relationship between self-leadership strategies and innovative behavior.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **Relationship between self-leadership strategies and innovative behaviour**

Literatures have shown that personal and contextual attributes can give impact to individual innovation (Thomas & Michael, 1999). One of the personal contribute is self-leadership strategies. Previously, self-leadership strategies influenced an individual innovative behavior by the application of behavioral, cognitive and intrinsic motivation approaches. However, the realm of self-leadership strategies have expanded beyond behavioral and cognitive elements by including physiological components as founded by Muller, Georgianna and Roux (2010). Empirically have shown that physical vitality also can give impact to an individual in truly self-lead themselves (Neck & Cooper, 2000). Thus, effect of physical vitality on innovative behavior had also been studied by a few researchers. Development of self-leadership concept have shown that self-leadership strategies refer to behavior-focused strategies, constructive thought pattern strategies, natural reward strategies and physical vitality strategies.

In terms of behavioral strategies, study by Shalley (1995) have suggested that the highest creativity occurred when individuals had a creativity behavior-focused on goal-setting and worked under expected evaluations. It is because goal-setting is only requires to assigning workers to a challenging and specific goals on important performance dimensions included innovative behavior (Carson & Carson, 1993). Similarly, study done by Hoelg and Parboteeah (2003), they found that team with behavior-focused on goal-setting behavior has done positive effects on team innovative performance in innovative projects. Goal-setting is believes to reduce uncertainty about the qualitative properties of the output expected as well as the time and budget constraints of the project.

---

For cognitive strategies of self-leadership, feeling of future successful market development are major factors influencing engagement in innovative behavior (Van der Panne, Van Beers, & Kleinknecht, 2003). Thus, the supported the positive effect of visualizing successful performance on innovative behavior. In the other research, individuals who utilize constructive thought pattern strategies are able to tackle and suggest solutions more effectively during innovation stage (Carmeli, Meitar, & Weisberg, 2006). In terms of intrinsic motivation, Chen, Wu and Chen (2010) in their study to understand the relationship among marine tourism employee's personality traits, work motivation and innovative behavior have found that employees with higher intrinsic motivation ( natural reward ) are more likely to generate innovative behavior. It is because they will exhibit more innovative behavior if they feel enjoy and challenges in their work. For natural reward, personnel often chase delightful or suitable works to fulfill self-actualized. Positive correlation also found in the relationship between intrinsic motivation and innovative behavior in the pharmaceutical industry (Sundgren, Dimenas, Gustafsson, & Selart, 2005).

For physical vitality, how can vitality give effect to innovative behavior can be explain within two approaches. Firstly, from the perspectives of innovative behaviors' job demands. Innovative behavior is often a response to uncertainties or high levels of demand in the environment (West, 2002). Innovative behavior requires change, and the attention the group has to devote to articulating, planning and implementing the changes is likely to represent an increase over the normal levels of attention they give to work with endless meetings and extremely long working hours. Increased workload may well lead to lower levels of satisfaction, well-being and long-term viability of the group, which in turn may threaten its long-term effectiveness. In another situation, other workers in the work environment may tend to resist those changes because of the insecurity and uncertainty they may bring. It is because habits and preferences for familiar practices and actions are 'hard to break' because people have a built-in tendency to return to their original behaviors. Convincing resistant workers of the benefits of innovation can be difficult and emotionally taxing. Given its demanding nature, innovative behavior can be conceived as a potential stressor that may give rise to stress reactions. It is believed that individual who can enjoy good vitality will be able to handle these demands and stresses more efficiently and perform better because individuals who are healthy are less likely to become obese, possess higher levels of energy and enjoy enhanced feelings of well-being. They can do work tasks without undue fatigue.

Secondly, it can be seen from the perspectives of mental performances. Innovative behaviors are known to generate and promote the new ideas within work environment. Thus, it is requires an individual to have a good mental performance in order to come out with a good ideas. Healthy and active people process data faster and experience a slower decline in information-processing speed than inactive people because vitality helps in promoting concentration and stimulates mental capacities with increasing the mental aptitude and performance. All of the exercises and good nutrition will help our body to reduce levels of homocysteine, an amino acid which, if present in the body it can be a risk factor for memory loss and cognitive decline.

#### **Transactional leadership as a moderator between self-leadership and innovative behavior**

A transactional leader is one who focuses on inspire followers to transcend their own self-interests and who are capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on followers. It refers to leaders who guide or motivate their followers in the direction of established goals by clarifying role and task requirements. Characteristics of transactional leadership are contingent reward and management by exception (active or passive). In its active mode, the leader actively monitors deviances from standard by the follower and takes corrective action. In its passive mode, the leader waits for follower mistakes to happen and then takes corrective action.

Transactional leadership affect innovative behavior by creating a trusted management method by rewarding organizational members for their effort after doing a task which may help employees to cope with the potential uncertainty and complexity of new processes, practices or structures especially in innovation stages (Pieterse, van Knippenberg, Schippers, & Stam, 2010). By rewarding approach, an employee is more likely to involve in innovative behavior because they know that all their effort and difficulty that they have to face will be rewarded. Besides, the concept of trust in transactional leadership can give an opportunity to the employees to practices their self-leadership skill in affecting innovative behavior (Jung, 2001). It is because transactional leader is more likely to see the outcome of the task rather than the process to achieve the outcome. So, with the

concept of self-control by using self-leadership strategies, employees are freely to manage their own work without feel bonded with another.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research context**

Respondents in this study were engineers of Electronics and Electricals (E&E) manufacturing company in Malaysia. The company's main responsibility was to process the industrial production in which raw materials are transformed in finished goods and ready for sale. In the survey, the participating organizations fulfilling the criteria that registered with the Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers.

#### **3.2 Procedure and sample**

Permission was sought from the Human Resource Departments of the various organizations of interest. Once permission was granted, the researcher sought specific demographical information about the teams from the Human Resources Departments. This was to purposively select only those teams that met the criteria for inclusion of teams in the study. The inclusion criteria are engineers who mostly involved in innovation process in Electronics and Electricals (E&E) manufacturing company. The questionnaires and envelopes were distributed to team members through the respective team leaders. The team leaders collected the completed questionnaires in sealed envelope and handed them to the researcher. Data collection lasted for 10 weeks. Surveys were sent to 18 companies and were be informed early about the research via phone and email. About six companies rejected to give cooperation within this study based on confidential issues. All the participants in this study are voluntary to take part. Respondents were asked to rate their own level of self-leadership strategies and the level of innovative behavior. In addition, they also required to rate the level of transactional leadership of their leader. From the 745 sets of questionnaires, only 9.3 per cent rejected due to incomplete responses given by the respondents. Therefore, the researcher uses 485 sets of questionnaire as the respond to the research objectives of the study.

#### **3.3 Measures**

##### **3.3.1 Self-leadership strategies**

To measure self-leadership strategies element, the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaires (RSLQ) was used (Houghton & Neck, 2002). It consists of 35 items included items that measure about behavior-focused strategies, constructive thought pattern strategies and natural reward strategies of self-leadership with 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale consisted of 18 items of behavior-focused strategies measuring the subscales self-goal setting, self-reward, self-punishment, self-observation and self-cueing. The constructive thought pattern dimension is represented by 12 items with three subscales labeled visualizing successful performance, evaluating beliefs and assumptions and self-talk. A single subscale consisting of 5 items represents the natural reward dimension which focusing thoughts on natural reward.

For strategies that focus on physical vitality, eight items from Muller, et al., (2010) was used. All of the items represented the strategies that address physiological states and processes which included the dimension of health program, physical activities and healthy nutrition. Responses were given in 4 point scales ranging from '*describe me very imprecisely*' at one end and '*describe me very precisely*' at the other.

##### **3.3.2 Innovative behavior**

Innovative behavior was measured on a scale used by Jong and Hartog (2008). The scale consisted of 10 items measuring opportunity exploration, idea generation, idea championing and implementation/application dimension of innovative behavior. Responses were given in 5-point scales ranging from '*never*' as one end and '*always*' at the other.

### 3.4 Statistical Analysis

Data obtained were analyzed through the Structural Equation Model (SEM) and IBM SPSS 19 statistical program. The SEM was assessing the measurement models to evaluate the quality of measurement items before proceed to the hypotheses testing. The model fit indicators that were used for model fit are normal chi-square (CMIN/df), P-value, GFI (goodness-of-fit index), AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit), CFI (comparative fit index), TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index) and RAMSEA (root mean squared error of approximation). All the items that meet requirement are used for the hypotheses testing by using IBM SPSS 19 statistical program. The proposed relations were tested through regression (for effect between independent and dependent variables) and hierarchical regression analyses (for moderating effect of transactional leadership).

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows the demographic information with respect to the gender, age, ethnicity, education level, monthly income and year of services. It indicates that 55.3 per cent respondents were male and 44.7 per cent of respondent were female. Mean average for age of respondents is 29.72. For ethnicity information, Malay respondents contribute the highest percentages out of other ethnicity with total percentages with 65.4 per cent. Chinese respondents at the second higher percentage with 24.3 per cent and Indian respondents were at the third position with 6.8 per cent. Only 3.5 per cent of respondents were from other ethnicity (Christian, Philippines and Kadazan). The table also indicates that the demographic information about the respondents with respect to the education level which were taken in this research. About 55.5 per cent of the respondents were Bachelor Degree holder, 7.0 per cent of the respondents were Master's Degree holder, only 0.6 per cent of the respondents were Doctor of Philosophy holder and other category of education level (diploma and professional certificate) provides about 36.7 per cent out of total of respondents. Remaining 2.9 per cent of the respondents were belonging to monthly income with average RM5, 001 to RM6, 000 per month, and only 3.1 per cent were with more than RM6, 000 per month. For length of service information, respondents with service less than 2 years contribute the highest percentages with 47.4 per cent. About 24.1 per cent of the respondents belong to services between more than 2 years up to 4 years length of services. 14.2 per cent belong to respondents with length of services more than 4 years up to 6 years and this category shared the same total of percentages with more than 6 years service's respondents.

**Table 1: Demographic Analysis**

Personal Characteristics	Mean or % (n=485)
<b>Gender</b>	
Male	55.3%
Female	44.7%
<b>Age</b>	29.72
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
Malay	65.4%
Chinese	24.3%
Indian	6.8%
Other	3.5%
<b>Education</b>	
Bachelor Degree	55.5%
Master	7.0%
Doctor of Philosophy	0.6%
Other	36.7%
<b>Service</b>	
< 2 years	47.4%
>2 year - < 4 years	24.1%
>4 years - < 6 years	14.2%
>6 years	14.2%

## 4.2 Hypotheses Testing

### 4.2.1 Regression Analysis

This study has four main hypotheses in term of investigating about the effect between independent variables and dependent variable which are:

1. Behavior-focused strategies have positive and significant effect on innovative behavior among Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing engineers.
2. Constructive thought pattern strategies have positive and significant effect on innovative behavior among Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing engineers.
3. Natural reward strategies have positive and significant effect on innovative behavior among Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing engineers.
4. Physical vitality strategies have positive and significant effect on innovative behavior among Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing engineers.

**Table 2: Regression Analysis**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
<b>1</b>					
(Constant)	4.259	.141		30.167	.000
Behavior-focused	1.074	.056	.650	19.233	.000
Constructive thought	.821	.056	.546	14.540	.000
Natural reward	.709	.051	.526	13.874	.000
Physical vitality	.938	.054	.610	17.239	.000

Table 2 presents standardized regression weights, standardized beta coefficients, representing beta weights of self-leadership strategies on innovative behavior. Considering the standardized regression coefficients, strategies that focus on behavior-focused, constructive thought pattern, natural reward and physical vitality have strong significant and positive path coefficients towards innovative behavior. The standard regression weight of behavior-focused strategies for innovative is 0.650,  $p < 0.001$  which means the increase in behavior-focused strategies by 1 is responsible for increase in innovative behavior by 0.650 and vice versa. This has proved the first hypothesis true that behavior-focused has a positive effect on innovative behavior. For the hypothesis 2 also has been supported by data as standardized effect on innovative behavior by constructive thought pattern is 0.546,  $p < 0.001$ . It shows that when constructive thought pattern goes up by 1 standard deviation, innovative behavior goes up by 0.546 standard deviation. Direct positive effect of natural reward on innovative behavior and direct positive effect of physical vitality on innovative behavior also are concerned that the findings support the hypothesis. The standardized path coefficient of natural reward for innovative behavior is 0.526 at  $p = 0.000$ , meanwhile coefficient for physical vitality for innovative behavior is 0.610 at  $p = 0.000$ , which are a significant positive effect between the both.

### 4.2.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

This study also has four main hypotheses in term of investigating about the moderator effect of transactional leadership in the relationship between independent variables and dependent variable which are:

1. Transactional leadership will moderate the relationship between behavior-focused strategies on innovative behavior among Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing engineers.
2. Transactional leadership will moderate the relationship between constructive thought pattern strategies on innovative behavior among Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing engineers.
3. Transactional leadership will moderate the relationship between natural reward strategies on innovative behavior among Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing engineers.

4. Transactional leadership will moderate the relationship between physical vitality strategies on innovative behavior among Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing engineers.

In term to analyses the moderator effect by using hierarchical regression, there are a few step must be followed. In first step, control variables were entered to control the effect of any external factor. In this research, control variables were gender and monthly salary. In second step, independent variable (behavior-focused strategies, constructive thought pattern strategies, natural reward strategies and physical vitality strategies) and moderator (transactional leadership) was entered. In third step, the interaction term of each of self-leadership strategies (behavior-focused strategies, constructive thought pattern strategies, natural reward strategies and physical vitality strategies) and transactional leadership were entered and regressed by innovative behavior.

Table 3 shows  $\Delta R^2 = 0.479$  (change in the  $R^2$ ), with ( $F=5.752$ ,  $df=479$ ,  $p<0.017$ ). The results show statistically significant values ( $\beta=0.135$ ,  $p<0.01$  verifying the moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship of behavior-focused strategies and innovative behavior, thus, support and accept the hypothesis where researcher hypothesize that 'there is a significant moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship between behavior-focused strategies of self-leadership and innovative behavior'.

**Table 3: Model Summary (Behavior-focused and Transactional Leadership)**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	$\beta$
1	.183a	.034	.029	.87035	.034	8.356	2	482	.000	0.116
2	.674b	.454	.450	.65506	.420	369.909	1	481	.000	1.074
3	.695c	.483	.479	.63763	.030	27.650	1	480	.000	0.305
4	.700d	.490	.484	.63450	.006	5.752	1	479	.017	0.135

a. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender

b. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Behavior-focused

c. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Behavior-focused, Transactional

d. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Behavior-focused, Transactional, BVXTSL

e. Dependent Variable: Innovative behavior

Table 4 shows  $\Delta R^2 = 0.402$  (change in the  $R^2$ ), with ( $F=3.256$ ,  $df=479$ ,  $p<0.072$ ). The results show statistically significant values ( $\beta=0.097$ ,  $p<0.01$  verifying the moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship of constructive thought pattern strategies and innovative behavior, thus, support and accept the hypothesis where researcher hypothesize that 'there is a significant moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship between constructive thought pattern strategies of self-leadership and innovative behavior'.

**Table 4: Model Summary (Constructive thought pattern and Transactional Leadership)**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	$\beta$
1	.183a	.034	.029	.87035	.034	8.356	2	482	.000	0.116
2	.573b	.329	.324	.72616	.295	211.421	1	481	.000	0.821
3	.638c	.407	.402	.68332	.078	63.216	1	480	.000	0.476
4	.641d	.411	.405	.68172	.004	3.256	1	479	.072	0.097

a. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender

b. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Constructive thought pattern

- c. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Constructive thought pattern , Transactional  
 d. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Constructive thought pattern , Transactional, CTXTSL  
 e. Dependent Variable: Innovative behavior

Table 5 shows  $\Delta R^2 = 0.402$  (change in the R2), with (F=8.406, df=479, p<0.004). The results show statistically significant values ( $\beta=0.140$ , p<0.01 verifying the moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship of natural reward strategies and innovative behavior, thus, support and accept the hypothesis where researcher hypothesize that ‘there is a significant moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship between natural reward strategies of self-leadership and innovative behavior’.

**Table 5: Model Summary (Natural reward and Transactional Leadership)**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	$\beta$
1	.183a	.034	.029	.87035	.034	8.356	2	482	.000	0.116
2	.557b	.310	.305	.73630	.276	192.485	1	481	.000	0.709
3	.652c	.425	.420	.67273	.115	96.195	1	480	.000	0.522
4	.659d	.435	.429	.66760	.010	8.406	1	479	.004	0.140

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Natural reward  
 c. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Natural reward, Transactional  
 d. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Natural reward, Transactional, NRXTSL  
 e. Dependent Variable: Innovative behavior

Table 6 shows  $\Delta R^2 = 0.491$  (change in the R2), with (F=4.432, df=479, p<0.036). The results show statistically significant values ( $\beta=0.129$ , p<0.01 verifying the moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship of physical vitality strategies and innovative behavior, thus, support and accept the hypothesis where researcher hypothesize that ‘there is a significant moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship between physical vitality strategies of self-leadership and innovative behavior’.

**Table 6: Model Summary (Physical Vitality and Transactional Leadership)**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	$\beta$
1	.183a	.034	.029	.87035	.034	8.356	2	482	.000	0.116
2	.635b	.403	.399	.68499	.369	297.167	1	481	.000	0.938
3	.704c	.495	.491	.63044	.092	87.836	1	480	.000	0.460
4	.707d	.500	.494	.62820	.005	4.432	1	479	.036	0.129

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Physical vitality  
 c. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Physical vitality , Transactional  
 d. Predictors: (Constant), Monthly Salary, Gender, Physical vitality , Transactional , PVXTSL  
 e. Dependent Variable: Innovative behavior

## 5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study is conducted in order to test the moderating effect of transactional leadership on the relationship between self-leadership strategies and innovative behaviour. Firstly, the effect of self-leadership strategies on



innovative behaviour is tested in the research. According to the results of analysis, it is seen that there is a positive effect of each of self-leadership strategies (behaviour-focused, constructive thought pattern, natural reward and physical vitality) on innovative behaviour. As innovation in the workplace is a complex process that often entails difficulties and obstacles, employees need to motivate themselves to accomplish tasks. People who possess good self-leadership qualities know how to achieve high levels of self-direction and self-motivation (Politis, 2006). Thus, effect of self-leadership strategies on innovative behaviour is very important. Behaviour-focused strategies are directed towards enhancing the self-consciousness and the management of essential, sometimes unpleasant, behaviours. It is important to setting guides and avoiding mistakes during innovation stages. Constructive thought pattern strategies refer to those thought patterns that are constructive in nature. Effect of constructive thought is important on innovative behaviour because individuals may alter their thought patterns to focus on potentially available opportunities in times of difficulties, rather than thinking about the difficulties as obstacles during the applying of innovative behaviour in the workplace (Ramamoorthy, Flood, Slattey, & Sardesai, 2005). Intrinsic motivation effect by natural reward strategies also important in effecting innovative behaviour as it seems that because of the complexity of the innovation process, employees have to find the work itself valuable and enjoyable. In addition, effect of physical vitality on innovative behaviour also very important as founded by when ability to perform and problem solving are increase when employees feeling healthy. It seems reasonable to suggest that when individuals are positively aroused and are feeling healthy, capable and energetic they will more actively involved in seek ideas, make suggestions, engage in thought-provoking conversations and will playfully approach novel directions.

The most important contribution of this study to the related literature is that it deals with transactional leadership as a moderating variable in the relationship between self-leadership strategies and innovative behaviour. It is seen that cohesion and pressure dimensions of transactional leadership has a moderating effect on this relationship. According to the results, the higher the transactional leadership is applied by a leader, the more positive effect of each of self-leadership strategies on innovative behaviour. The reason could be that reinforcement and reward are used by transactional leaders desirable to enhance innovation and high performance among employees. It focuses on more of the personal side of the organizational the interactions as well as vision, teamwork and values. Besides, this type of leadership is constantly meeting new people, making deals and moving on which are an important elements for innovativeness. Furthermore, leadership in organizations is important in shaping workers' perceptions, responses to organizational change, and acceptance of innovations, such as evidence-based practices. Transactional leadership moderates the relationship between self-leadership and innovative behaviour by allocates work to the employees. They can apply their self-leadership when they are considered to be fully responsible on their task whether or not they have the resources or capability to carry it out. When things go wrong, then the employees is considered to be personally at fault, and is punished for their failure just s they are rewarded for succeeding. Electricals and Electronics (E&E) manufacturing companies are private organizations where control is one of the requirement in day-today work and control is also the dominant features of the transactional leadership style. Therefore, transactional leadership believed can moderate the relationship between self-leadership strategies and innovative behaviour.

## 6. Acknowledgement

This study was partially done from thesis to complete the Doctoral of Philosophy study. The author is grateful to the Human Resources Officer from each of the participated electrical and electronics (E&E) manufacturing companies in Malacca, Malaysia for providing a good cooperation and facilities to carry out the research.

## 7. References

- Boerner, S., Eisenbeis, S. A., & Griesser, D. (2007). Follower behavior and organizational performance: the impact of transformational leaders. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(3), 16-25.
- Carmeli, A., Meitar, R., & Weisberg, J. (2006). Self-leadership skills and innovative behavior at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), 75-90.
- Carson, P. P., & Carson, K. D. (1993). Managing Creativity Enhancement Through Goal-Setting and Feedback\*. [10.1002/j.2162-6057.1993.tb01385.x]. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 27(1), 36-45.
- Chen, S. C., Wu, M. C., & Chen, C. H. (2010). Employee's personality traits, work motivation and innovative behavior in Marine tourism industry. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 3, 198-205.

- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: - A review in context. [doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00061-8]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581-613.
- Hoegl, M., & Parboteeah, K. P. (2003). Goal setting and team performance in innovative projects: on the moderating role of teamwork quality. *Small Group Research*, 34(1), 3-19.
- Houghton, J. D., & Neck, C. P. (2002). The revised self-leadership questionnaire: testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(8), 672-691.
- Jong, J., & Hartog, D. (2008). Innovative work behavior: measurement and validation. *Scientific Analysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs*, 4-27.
- Jung, D. I. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13(2), 185-195.
- Khan, M. J., & Aslam, N. (2012). Leadership styles as predictors of innovative work behavior. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9(2), 17-22.
- Kumako, S. K., & Asumeng, M. A. (2013). Transformational leadership as a moderator of the relationship between psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams in Ghana. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(1), 1-9.
- Muller, G. F., Georgianna, S., & Roux, G. (2010). Self-leadership and physical vitality. *Psychological Reports*, 10, 383-392.
- Neck, C. P., & Cooper, K. H. (2000). The fit executive: exercise and diet guidelines for enhancing performance. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(2), 72-82.
- Philipp, B. L. U., & Lopez, P. D. J. (2013). The moderating role of ethical leadership : Investigating relationships among employee psychological contracts, commitment and citizenship behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(3), 304-315.
- Pieterse, A. N., van Knippenberg, D., Schippers, M., & Stam, D. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behavior: The moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(4), 609-623.
- Politis, J. D. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership predictors of the stimulant dweterminants to creativity in organizational work environments. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 2(2), 23-34.
- Politis, J. D. (2006). Self-leadership behavioural-focused strategies and team performance: the mediating influence of job satisfaction. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(3), 203-216.
- Ramamoorthy, N., Flood, P. C., Slattery, T., & Sardessai, R. (2005). Determinants of Innovative Work Behavior: Development and test of an Integrated Model. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 142-150.
- Shalley, C. E. (1995). Effects of coaction, expected evaluation and goal setting on creativity productivity. *Academy Management*, 38(2), 483-503.
- Stewart, G. L., Courtright, S. H., & Manz, C. C. (2011). Self-leadership: a multilevel review. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 185-222.
- Sundgren, M., Dimenas, E., Gustafsson, J.-E., & Selart, M. (2005). Drivers of organizational creativity: a path model of creative climate in pharmaceutical R&D. *R&D Management*, 35(4), 359-374.
- Thomas, B., & Michael, C. (1999). Proactive Behavior: Meaning, Impact, Recommendations. *Business Horizons*, 42(3), 63-73.
- Vaccaro, I. G., Jansen, J. J. P., Bosch, F. A. J. V. D., & Volberda, H. W. (2012). Management innovation and leadership : the moderating role of organizational size. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(1), 28-51.
- Van der Panne, G., Van Beers, C., & Kleinknecht, A. (2003). Success and failure of innovation: a literature review. *International Jornal of Innovation Management*, 7(3), 309-338.
- Vries, R. E. d., Roe, R. A., & Taillieu, T. C. B. (2002). Need for leadership as a moderator of the relationships between leadership and individual outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 121-137.
- West, M. A. (2002). Sparkling fountains or stagnant ponds: an integrative model of creativity and innovation implementation in work groups. *Applied Psychology: an international review*, 51(3), 355-424.

## Exploring Employees' Followership and Cognitive Style

Nur Faezahbinti Mahmud<sup>1</sup> and Rabeatul Husna Abdull Rahman<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Postgraduate Student, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Department of Human Resource Development, Faculty of Management, 81310 Skudai, Johor, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>Senior Lecturer, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Department of Human Resource Development, Faculty of Management, 81310 Skudai, Johor, Malaysia

**Abstract** This paper reviews the relationship between followership style and cognitive style. It reviews Kelley's (1992) model of followership styles which are "the-sheep", "pragmatist", "the yes-people", "the star follower", and "alienated". Meanwhile for cognitive styles, this paper reviews Allinson and Hayes's (1996) model which consists of "analytical" and "intuitive" style.

**Keywords:** Followership, followers, "the-sheep", "the yes-people", "the star-follower", "pragmatist", "alienated", "cognitive style", "analyst", "intuitive"

### 1. Introduction

Followership research is a very interesting topic, however there is less research conducted on it (Hairuddin & Mohammed, 2008). One of the reason on why there is little research done on followership is because most of researchers believe that leadership and followership are coined together, however the truth is followership is an independent subject (Carsten et.al, 2010). Meanwhile according to the research done by Bjugstad et. al (2006) and Kellerman (2008), most researchers do not prefer to study followership because of the bad perception that people have on the terms of followers, as it is often defined as weak and passive. Focused by researchers, research and books are more on leaders, which lead people to undervalue followers (Kelley, 1992). Most of us misunderstood the concept of leaders are more important than followers, when the inalienable truth is "Leaders exist only with followers", (Dixon, 2003).

There are several researches on followership in Malaysia, amongst them are by Ismail et.al (2009), Hairuddin & Mohammed (2008) and Dania (1998), each of these researchers studied on followership in various organization. Research done by Ismail et.al (2009), studied on the relationship between transformational leadership, empowerment and followers' performance. The other research conducted in Malaysia is by Hairuddin & Mohammed (2008), which they did research on factors influencing faculty followership's perception of institutional leader in Malaysian Institutions of higher learning. And then there is a study done by Dania (1998), understanding the concept of followership in organization. These researchers had their research done on the topic followership; however majority of the researcher still studies the relation between followers and leaders.

Followers are the people who received and act according to their leaders' instruction because they shared the same goals as their leaders and at the same time they act according to the knowledge, skills and abilities that they possess to accomplish the organization goals (Kelley, 1992). However, followers are always been categorized as low ranks workers which makes